

# General Plan Program Citizens' Advisory Committee

## Minutes of Meeting #9 – November 17, 2003

---

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the General Plan program held its ninth meeting on Monday, November 7, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. in the 5<sup>th</sup> floor conference room of Riverside City Hall. Attendees were as follows:

### **CAC Members**

Chair David Leonard  
Sally Silva  
Kenneth Sutter  
Maureen Kane  
Morgan Keith  
Judy Teunissen  
Barry Johnson  
Maynard Lorry  
Tom Pevehouse  
Colleen McBride  
David McNiel

### **Other interested parties in attendance**

Mary Humboldt  
Robert Caliva  
Gabrielle Mankin  
Ray Higgins  
Ralph Hileman  
Gregory Williams

### **City Staff**

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director  
Craig Aaron, Principal Planner  
Diane Jenkins, AICP, Senior Planner  
Robert Laag, Planning Intern  
Kathy Gonzalez, Deputy City Attorney

### **Consultant Team**

Laura Stetson, Cotton/Bridges/Associates  
John Cook, Cotton/Bridges/Associates

## **I. Introductory Remarks**

Chair Leonard called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. In his introductory remarks, he noted that the next CAC meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2004; there will be no CAC meeting on December 8<sup>th</sup>. The meeting topic on January 12 will be a review of results of the proposed land uses on the planned transportation network.

## **II. Review and Approval of Minutes, October 27, 2003**

No changes to the minutes were proposed. Approval of the minutes was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved.

## **III. Update on Land Use and Circulation Planning**

Laura Stetson reiterated that proposed land uses were being prepared for a run through the City's transportation model. She stated that she anticipated the results would be ready for CAC review and discussion at the January 12, 2004 meeting.

## **IV. Main Discussion: Riverside's Sphere of Influence**

Laura Stetson introduced the topic of the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI). She stated that in contrast to the specificity of prior discussion regarding land uses within the City, a discussion of the SOI would require a broader perspective. She stated that the goals for the evening included a discussion of the basic premises of the SOI, a review of the City's annexation policies, and a review of pending annexations. She said the discussion would also include specific review of the City's existing General Plan designations for both Northern and Southern Sphere areas, compared with Riverside County's designations for same.

She stated that SOIs are unincorporated areas adjacent to cities that could be candidates for future annexation. SOIs typically exclude areas to which infrastructure could not be extended easily (or would be easier served by another nearby jurisdiction). This is why the City's Northern SOI does not cross the Santa Ana River. She stated that SOI boundaries are established formally by the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

Stetson stated that even though SOI areas are outside the City's limits, cities are generally encouraged to plan for SOI areas in two ways: through General Plan designations and pre-zoning. Although the City's plans for SOI areas would not have immediate effect (County designations would still rule), the City's plans would come into effect upon an area's annexation to the City.

Ken Gutierrez briefly reviewed the City's annexation policies. He stated that Measure C (1987) states that the City cannot accept any new annexation until it develops a plan for the SOI. The City completed its SOI plan in 1998 with a plan for the Southern Sphere area. He stated that the current Southern SOI goes very far south and that the City is currently recommending that Riverside's Southern Sphere end at the Cajalco ridge, just south of Cajalco Road.

Director Gutierrez stated that annexations are typically initiated by developers interested in connecting their projects approved by the County to City services, particularly sewer

services. He stated that very few annexations have been initiated by the City. He then provided details on several pending annexation cases.

### **Pending Annexation Cases**

#### **GATEWAY (#88)**

This area includes 320 acres within the County's Gateway Specific Plan; the site is northeast of the I-215 and east of Watkins Drive. The Gateway Specific Plan's proposed land uses include 259 multiple-family units, 294 single-family units, about 93 acres of office/commercial area, and about 76 acres for open space/park uses. This area is shown on the County's Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) as a sensitive area bridging Sycamore Canyon and Box Springs Mountain reserves.

#### **CIRCLE K (#91)**

This is limited to a single site (0.45 acres) at Van Buren Boulevard and Wood Road. A Circle K market on this site experienced septic failure; the basis for the annexation request was to connect to City sewer services.

#### **SPRING MOUNTAIN RANCH (#92)**

The developer of this 1,242-acre site is apparently no longer interested in annexing to Riverside and is instead seeking sewer connections from the City of Colton.

#### **NORTH ORANGE STREET (#95)**

This 90-acre site is on the north side of town and consists of a small neighborhood off Chase Road. The City Council has authorized the potential annexation; Riverside County LAFCO will consider the annexation request on November 17, 2003.

#### **LURIN AVENUE (#96)**

This site used to be called the Alta Cresta Area after Riverside County had approved the Alta Cresta Specific Plan. However, the master-planned development never materialized. Pieces of the area are being individually developed. The City has pre-zoned the area; Director Gutierrez recommended that the CAC recognize and endorse this pre-zoning.

#### **BERRY ROAD (#97)**

This is a 411-acre site west of Trautwein Road; it is an extension of Corinthian Drive. Riverside County LAFCO would like the City to annex it because it forms a "donut hole" of unincorporated area. The City Council is scheduled to consider the matter at its December 2, 2003 meeting.

#### **R-CARL PROPERTIES (#98)**

This is similar to the Circle K annexation in that it was initiated by a property experiencing septic failure and wishing to tie into the City's sewer system. The half-acre site is adjacent to the Circle K property (Annexation #91).

#### **TWO TREES (#99)**

This is a 12-acre site with 5 dwelling units located on the slopes of Box Springs Mountain. The City is currently studying its potential to meet annexation requirements.

## **RANCHO EL SOBRANTE**

This is a large area just outside the southwestern corner of the City. Two developments (The Orchards and Lake Hills) are under construction. The City is studying the potential annexation of this site.

Director Gutierrez then discussed some potential future annexations.

**North Main Street:** This is a 61-acre area near the Riverside-San Bernardino County line that includes industrial, commercial, and single-family uses. As the site is surrounded by either the City of Riverside or San Bernardino County, Riverside County is challenged in providing services to this area. Several property owners in this area approached the City about annexation. The City is interested, but the application has not moved forward.

**University City:** This is a 125-acre site west of the I-215/60, across the freeway from the proposed Gateway annexation. The site's only connection to County services is across railroad tracks and through the Gateway area. The annexation of Gateway will make University City an island of unincorporated area. However, residents/property owners in this area have not expressed interest in being annexed by the City.

**Alessandro Boulevard:** This is a 162-acre area near Barton and Alessandro, containing single-family dwellings and a mobile home subdivision. Any future annexation of this area is likely to consist only of frontage along Van Buren Boulevard.

**Thompson-Kimmel Detachment:** This involves the realignment of the boundary between Riverside and Moreno Valley along the southern portion of the I-215 corridor.

Stetson reminded the CAC that the approval of 51% of property owners within any area is needed to finalize any proposed annexation.

Stetson stated that the March Air Reserve Base (MARB) will not be part of Riverside's SOI; the area is administered by a Joint Powers Authority (JPA). She stated that Riverside's General Plan needs to recognize what is planned for MARB, but will not have its own designation for the area.

Stetson then led the group through a comparison of City and County plans for the Northern and Southern Spheres of Influence.

## **Northern SOI: Highgrove Area**

Stetson stated that the City's plan for this area largely reflects what is on the ground. The County's plan, through the adopted RCIP, is heavily based on approved specific plans for the area, including Spring Mountain Ranch.

Stetson asked the CAC to consider keeping the City's General Plan designations for the area, switching to the County's RCIP designations for the area, or blending the two.

There followed some discussion of how to look at the areas generally. Maureen Kane asked if there were any County plans for the area that went against City goals and plans. She said that the CAC could focus only on areas where the County's designation may not be in the City's best interest.

Stetson noted that the County's plan for the Highgrove area showed more land in industrial designations than the City's plan. Director Gutierrez noted that the area is near focus Area #25, which the CAC had previously recommended as industrial. He stated that the surrounding residential area appears distressed; there could be a good opportunity to extend industrial uses into this area.

Regarding the eastern portions of Highgrove, Director Gutierrez stated that because the average slopes of this area exceed 30%, Proposition R and Measure C dictate that this area would have to be designated as Hillside Residential. Deputy City Attorney Gonzalez told the CAC that Proposition R and Measure C do indeed set forth a slope-based classification for areas to be annexed. Further, lands in agricultural use would be required to go into the RA-5 Zone if annexed to the City. These requirements cannot be changed without a vote of the people.

After further discussion, the CAC directed consultants and staff to apply the requirements of Proposition R and Measure C wherever conditions warranted.

The group then focused on the areas not affected by R and C – specifically, the unincorporated areas west and east of the I-215, just south of the San Bernardino County line.

#### **West of I-215**

Following discussion of this area, the group agreed to maintain the City's designations for this area (industrial near the freeway, residential behind).

#### **Iowa-Center Street Area**

The group agreed to maintain the City's industrial designation for the area rather than the commercial designation of the County's plan.

#### **Box Springs/University City Area**

West of freeway: Change City's plan to reflect County proposals for this area (Commercial, medium-density residential)

East of freeway: Maintain City's plan (HR; the area is steeply sloped)

#### **SOUTHERN SPHERE OF INFLUENCE**

Stetson noted that most of this area, given its slope and agricultural uses, is subject to the restrictions of Proposition R and Measure C. She stated that the County has approved many specific plans for the area, most of which include more intensive development than would be permitted under R and C. She stated that the RCIP estimates a potential population of 73,000 people in the Southern Sphere area.

Director Gutierrez reiterated his recommendation that the CAC endorse the City Council's plan for the Alta Cresta area. He stated that the area once had agricultural designations, but the citrus trees on many of the sites have been removed. He stated that R and C allow that where already developed properties are exempt from the pre-zoning requirement.

Stetson asked the group about potential annexation policies for this area.

Maureen Kane stated that there seem to be essentially two types of annexations:

1. Where a developer is creating a community, and
2. Older rural areas w/ homes that are not being developed/redeveloped

She stated that the City may need to have two types of rules to address these different situations.

Stetson suggested that the group first discuss the instance of developer-created communities. In cases where developers have entitlements from the County, are there conditions the City should set to allow an annexation to proceed?

Chair Leonard noted that there ought to be continuity of City control of streets; it does not make sense for responsibility to be split up. He also noted that Mariposa Avenue serves as the dividing line between Riverside USD and the Val Verde School District.

The group also agreed that the City's SOI plan should reflect commercial areas designated by the County along Cajalco Road and Van Buren Boulevard.

In summarizing opinions expressed, Stetson stated that annexation policies could distinguish between unbuilt and built areas. Director Gutierrez stated that prior to any annexation, the City must complete a plan for services to ensure that the annexation area can be adequately served.

Chair Leonard asked if annexation policies could reflect aircraft noise zones, particularly in the vicinity of MARB. Stetson indicated that the SOI plan could reflect MARB's noise contours and AICUZ to help limit development inconsistent with the mission of the MARB. Director Gutierrez stated that the City's plans for SOI largely reflects the noise and "crash" zones. He added that the City of Riverside and the City of Moreno Valley are creating a Joint Land Use Overlay Zone to ensure sure that land uses in the area do not conflict with the use of MARB.

After further discussion, Stetson stated that the General Plan could include a policy that the City adopt a more specific annexation plan, including a comprehensive policy guide. This could be an implementation measure of the General Plan.

Maureen Kane stated that any annexation should not create financial concerns for the City. The General Plan should articulate this connection. Director Gutierrez stated that LAFCO requires a fiscal analysis of any proposed annexation over 100 acres in area. He also noted that Measure C includes language that any annexation must pay its own way: "new development shall pay all costs of providing urban services and infrastructure associated with urban development." Maureen Kane asked if the General Plan should restate this as a general plan policy. The group largely agreed with this.

Chair Leonard brought up the Alta Cresta area. He stated that the County has now approved housing on areas that had been planned (in the Specific Plan) for parks and schools. He asked what could be done to ensure that urban services and facilities actually get provided. He noted that a traditional way of handling this issue is to require that certain "lumps" of infrastructure be provided when development exceeds a certain threshold number of residential units. Maureen Kane responded that if the City were to set forth a

threshold, all of the tracts would end up being divided just below the threshold to avoid the requirement of infrastructure provision.

Stetson stated that she heard clear concern of a need for City policy to not permit development to proceed ahead of critical public facilities.

After further discussion, Stetson and Chair Leonard suggested that a condition of final annexation could be a facility service plan. Stetson added that there could be a minimum annexation size to avoid "piecemealing" parcels into the City. Chair Leonard stated that more stringent LAFCO review requirements are triggered for annexation areas 100 acres or greater.

Tom Pevehouse suggested that annexation policy could strongly articulate that the provision of service facilities such as schools, parks, and other infrastructure is tantamount to the City annexation policy; without these facilities in place, the City would not consider annexing a particular area.

Chair Leonard asked if the General Plan should recognize the Specific Plan at McAllister and El Sobrante Road. Director Gutierrez responded that it should not be recognized as a vested right until there is actual construction on the ground.

Chair Leonard noted that the County has approved another Specific Plan at Wood Road and Cajalco Creek (#229) but since nothing has been built yet, the GP should retain the agricultural designation.

## **V. Wrap-up; preview of next meetings**

Stetson stated that the consultants would make all of the changes agreed upon in the Land Use policy map. She stated that these proposed land uses would form the foundation for a run of the circulation model to determine the circulation impacts of the proposed land uses. She said that this would be discussed at the next CAC meeting on January 12, 2004.

## **VI. Matters from the Audience**

Mary Humboldt, from the Measure C Committee, urged fiscal analyses in advance of annexations, particularly large ones. She stated that she also represents Friends of Riverside's Hills. She stated that hilly areas should be zoned RC even if they are already developed with other uses so as to prevent unwanted uses such as second dwelling units.

Robert Caliva, representing Supervisor Buster's office, stated that he had been involved with the Washington-Alessandro Committee (WAC); he stated that the WAC has prepared a presentation that deals with City and County infrastructure issues in the near southern sphere area. He stated that the presentation would be made to the County Board of Supervisors on November 25<sup>th</sup> and that he would be happy to make the presentation to the CAC and/or to provide staff and CAC members with CD copies of the presentation.

Ray Higgins commented on the WAC presentation. He stated that as a means of ensuring that adequate infrastructure is provided, the City could adopt an ordinance imposing criminal penalties for failing to provide urban services. He stated that the City had to pay

several million dollars for needed public improvements in the Orangecrest area after a developer failed to follow through.

Ralph Hileman identified himself as the chairman of a homeowners' association near Lake Matthews. He stated that he and his group would like to help the City plan for this area in any way.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Leonard adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.